

REMARKS

Amendments to the Claims:

Claim 19 and claim 27 have each been amended for clarity by eliminating redundant terms and by internally reordering some elements, and have each been further amended to add the limitation, “*...assembling the selected information into a document, wherein the client does not specify an arrangement of components to create the document,*” which is supported at least by figure 4 of the applicant’s drawings as well as the written specification in its entirety, because the specification does not, at any place therein, teach or suggest that the client specifies an arrangement of components to create the document.

Claim 22 has been amended for consistency of terminology in view of the amendments to claim 19, from which claim 22 depends.

Rejection of Claims Under 35 U.S.C. §103:

Claims 19-34 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent 6,134,568 to Tonkin in view of EP 0621563 A1 ("EP").

The Applicant notes that a rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103 requires that the prior art references when combined must teach or suggest all the claim limitations. (MPEP 706.02(j).)

The examiner contends that, with respect to claims 19 and 27, Tonkin discloses the following elements:

providing a client interface, wherein the client interface includes at least a portion of a network;

detecting a client inquiry via the interface;

presenting an information selection prompt via the interface in response to the client inquiry;

receiving a client selection via the client interface in response to presenting the information selection prompt; and

selected data retrieved from a database, the selected data corresponding to the client selection.

1 The examiner contends further that EP teaches a system that calculates the
2 postage and prints it on the booklet, wherein the postage amount is calculated by the
3 total weight of selected items with known weights.

4 The applicant points out that claims 19 and 27 have been amended herein to
now include the following element:

5 wherein the client does not specify an arrangement of components to create
6 the document.

7 The applicant contends that this new element contained in each of claims 19
and 27 is not taught or suggested by either Tonkin or EP, and more particularly, that
8 this new element is directly opposite of what is taught by Tonkin.

9 Specifically, Tonkin teaches that the user inputs "information specifying an
10 arrangement of components to create the document. (Tonkin, abstract, col. 2, lines
11 27-33, 41-50, col. 6, lines 22-40, also see figures 4-9.)

12 Thus, because Tonkin teaches that the user inputs information specifying an
arrangement of components to create the document, it follows that the teachings of
13 Tonkin are therefore directly opposed to the limitation "wherein the client **does not**
14 specify an arrangement of components to create the document".

15 Accordingly, neither of claims 19 or 27 is obvious in view of Tonkin and/or EP
because Tonkin and/or EP, either individually or when combined, do not teach or
suggest all of the limitations of either claim 19 or claim 27, as is required for a finding
17 of obviousness.

18 Accordingly, the applicant respectfully requests that the rejections of claim 19
19 and claim 27 be withdrawn and that each of those claims be allowed.

20 The applicant notes that each of claims 20-26 depends from claim 19. Thus,
each of claims 20-26 contains all of the elements of claim 19. Therefore, each of
21 claims 20-26 is nonobvious in view of Tonkin and/or EP for at least the reasons that
22 claim 19 is nonobvious as set forth herein above.

23 Similarly, the applicant notes that each of claims 28-34 depends from claim
24 27, and that each of claims 28-34 thus contain all of the elements of claim 27.
Therefore, each of claims 28-34 is nonobvious in view of Tonkin and/or EP for at
25 least the reasons that claim 27 is nonobvious as set forth herein above.

 Accordingly, the applicant respectfully requests that the rejections of each of
claims 20-26 and 28-34 be withdrawn and that each of those claims be allowed.

SUMMARY

The applicant believes that this communication is fully responsive to the Office action mailed 01/31/2006. The applicant requests timely allowance of claims 19-34.

Respectfully submitted,

Carl S. CHOW

Date: April 20, 2006

By:

Thomas A. Olson
Attorney and agent for Applicant
Reg. No. 44,271
Phone: (509) 327-4748